REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4 and 8 are amended by the present amendment. Claims 1 and 8 are amended to move subject matter recited in the preamble of the claim into the body of the claim, and Claims 2-4 are amended only to correct cosmetic matters of form. Thus, no new matter is presented.

In the Final Official Action of October 22, 2007 (herein, the Final Office Action), Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ludwig et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0225832, herein Ludwig) in view of Yogeswar et al. (U.S. Pat. 7,035,468, herein Yogeswar).

In response to the above noted rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 8 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 1, for example, recites a system for archiving a collaboration over a network, comprising:

> an input adapter operable to accept the collaboration, which includes plural cotemporaneous media streams, ***each media stream having a different media type*** and at least one media stream ***having a different start or stop time from another media stream***, over a network interface;
>
> an archive engine operable to accept the cotemporaneous plural media streams of the collaboration from the input adapter and to format the plural media streams of the collaboration for storage as a session by appending each of the plural media streams with time-relationship data that identifies a time relationship ***between the plural media*** [having a different media type and having different start or stop times] ***of the collaboration***...

Independent Claim 8, while directed to an alternative embodiment, recites substantially similar features. Accordingly, the remarks and arguments presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 1 and 8.

Ludwig describes a multimedia collaborative system that integrates separate real time and asynchronous networks. However, as acknowledged in the Final Office Action, Ludwig does not disclose the "archive engine operable to accept the plural media of the collaboration from the input adapter" of Claim 1. To cure this deficiency, the Office Action applies Yogeswar. Applicants, however, respectfully submit that Ludwig fails to teach or suggest the claimed features directed to the "archive engine" for which it is asserted as a primary reference under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Ludwig describes a multimedia collaboration system that integrates separate real-time and asynchronous networks - the former for real-time audio and video, and the latter for control signals and textual, graphical and other data - in a manner that is interoperable across different computer and network operating system platforms and which closely approximates the experience of face-to-face collaboration, while liberating the participants from the limitations of time and distance.[1]

Ludwig, however, as admitted in the Office Action of March 21, 2007, fails to teach or suggest an archiving engine, whatsoever. Moreover, Ludwig fails to teach or suggest a system for archiving a collaboration over a network that includes "an archive engine operable to... format the plural media streams of the collaboration for storage as a session by appending each of the plural media streams with time-relationship data that ***identifies a time relationship between the plural media*** [having a different media type and having different start or stop times] ***of the collaboration***" as recited in independent Claim 1.

In rejecting the features directed to the "archive engine," the Final Office Action relied on paragraphs [0045-0046] of Ludwig. This cited portion of Ludwig describes that in a preferred embodiment, his system architecture employs separate real-time and asynchronous networks, as described above. These networks are interoperable across different computers,

[1] Ludwig, Abstract.

operating systems and network operating systems. The system architecture also accommodates a situation in which the user's desktop computing and/or communications equipment provides varying levels of media-handling capability. For example, a collaboration session may include participants whose equipment provides capabilities ranging from audio only or data only to a full complement of real-time, high-fidelity audio and full-motion video, and high-speed data network facilities.

Thus, Ludwig merely describes using different types of networks to facilitate multimedia collaboration sessions between users, but fails to teach or suggest archiving separate media streams by associating the streams with one another, whatsoever. More particularly, Ludwig fails to teach or suggest that his system includes "an archive engine operable to... format the plural media streams of the collaboration for storage as a session by appending each of the plural media streams with time-relationship data that ***identifies a time relationship between the plural media*** [having a different media type and having different start or stop times] ***of the collaboration***," as recited in independent Claim 1.

Yogeswar, the secondary reference, describes methods and an apparatus for archival storage and retrieval of audio/video information. The data archived in Yogeswar is archived in accordance with an intermediate archive format (IAF). The IAF supported formats allow metadata to be incorporated with the encoded A/V data (e.g., as auxiliary data) without interfering with the ability of a decoder.[2] The types of information used in Yogeswar include a) quality information; b) intended use information; and c) image source information.[3] Using this information, Yogeswar automatically selects a video/audio encoding format and associated parameters suitable for an indicated user or application. Alternatively, the system can suggest formats/encoding levels to a system user for their review and approval.[4]

---

[2] Yogeshwar, col. 6, l. 44-col. 7, l. 22.
[3] Id., col. 7, ll. 41-57.
[4] Id., col. 8, ll. 21-25.

Fig. 2 of Yogeswar illustrates a flowchart 200 showing the steps of retrieving and distributing data stored in the archive. In step 208, information to be retrieved is located as a result of a search. Using the location information, user's specified information in the form of an IAF encoded data is retrieved from the archive.[5]

In another embodiment of Yogeswar, an analysis and indexing module 314 receives A/V material in compressed digital form, and analyzes an index the received data using index 321 to create index information which can be used in searching and accessing the encoded data. The analysis and indexing module 314 can also retrieve existing archived IAF file content, thereby allowing indexing or reindexing to be done at any time.[6]

The IAF file of Yogeswar includes a compressed audio/video bitstream, plus ancillary metadata that describes, tags or otherwise specially marks the bitstream or bitstreams which are multiplexed with the metadata into the IAF file.[7] The IAF file is supplied to an archive storage manager which is responsible for placing the file in the archive. Then, in step 116, the IAF file is stored on the archive media for future retrieval. After the IAF file has been stored, the archived generation process stops.[8] The IAF file of Yogeswar includes one or more elements, including a time code (e.g., as per SMPTE). These time codes can be used for synchronization and as access points.[9]

However, Yogeswar does not disclose or suggest that the "time-relationship data identifies a time relationship ***between the plural media*** [having a different media type and having different start or stop times] ***of the collaboration***," as recited in Applicants' Claim 1. First, the time-stamp data of Yogeswar is largely undefined. However, Applicants interpret the time-stamp of Yogeswar to be an absolute time (i.e., defining a time-relationship between a single stream and a reference clock). Yogeswar does not disclose or suggest storing

---

[5] Id., col. 10, ll. 19-44.
[6] Id., col. 15, ll. 18-60.
[7] Id., col. 9, ll. 52-55.
[8] Id., col. 10, ll. 14-18.
[9] Id., col. 16, ll. 35-48.

anything more than one stream. Thus, secondly, Yogeswar does not store relative time information (i.e., defining a time-relationship between a first stream and a second stream).

Therefore, Ludwig and Yogeswar, neither alone, nor in combination, teach or suggest a system for archiving a collaboration over a network including "an archive engine operable to... format the plural media streams of the collaboration for storage as a session by appending each of the plural media streams with time-relationship data that ***identifies a time relationship between the plural media*** [having a different media type and having different start or stop times] ***of the collaboration***," as recited in independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 (and the claims that depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. For substantially similar reasons, it is also submitted that independent Claim 8 (and the claims that depend therefrom) also patentably define over Ludwig and Yogeswar.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-22, is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)
MM/rac

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\26s\263516US\263516US - AM DUE 072208.DOC